

COSMOGENIC  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  FROM NEUTRON CAPTURE BY  $^{35}\text{Cl}$  IN THE CHICO L6 CHONDRITE: ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE FOR LARGE SHIELDING; D.H. Garrison, D.D. Bogard, (NASA, Johnson Space Center, Houston, TX 77058) & G.F. Herzog (Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, NJ 08903).

The cosmic-ray-produced  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  ratio measured in iron meteorites is  $\sim 0.65$  but is not well determined for stone meteorites due to the common presence of trapped Ar or adsorbed atmospheric Ar in bulk analyses. Almost all single-extraction measurements of stones give  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  ratios intermediate between the trapped and air values of 5.3 and the expected cosmogenic value of  $\sim 0.65$  (1). Cosmic ray interactions produce  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  directly and through the  $^{36}\text{Cl}$  precursor (half-life,  $3 \times 10^5$  yrs). The high-energy production rate of  $^{36}\text{Cl}$  in chondrites is predicted to be 3-8 atoms/min/kg (2), and virtually all of the limited  $^{36}\text{Cl}$  measurements in chondrites are within this range (3). Theoretically,  $^{36}\text{Cl}$  can also be produced in significant amounts in large meteorites by thermal neutron capture on  $^{35}\text{Cl}$  (2). Except for Allende (4), significant excesses of  $^{36}\text{Cl}$  and/or cosmogenic  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  attributable to neutron capture have not been reported for any chondrite, including samples of variable shielding from large chondrites. The Chico L6 chondrite is a good candidate for observing cosmogenic  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  produced by neutron capture because: 1) it had a long irradiation under very large shielding (5); 2) an impact  $\sim 0.5$  Ga ago strongly degassed it of radiogenic  $^{40}\text{Ar}$  and presumably any trapped Ar as well; 3) measurements of  $^{37}\text{Ar}$  and  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  by stepwise temperature degassing of neutron-irradiated Chico samples define the release of cosmogenic Ar produced from Ca in relation to neutron-capture Ar produced from Cl sites; and 4) we determined the [Cl] for the irradiated samples.

The isotopic composition of Ar was measured for stepwise temperature release of both chondritic and melt portions of Chico. For the neutron-irradiated samples, most of the  $^{37}\text{Ar}$  and  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  (produced in the reactor from Ca and  $^{37}\text{Cl}$ , respectively), and most of the cosmogenic  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  were released at relatively high extraction temperatures of 1100-1600°C, suggesting that Cl contamination is not significant. From the reaction  $^{37}\text{Cl} (n, \gamma) ^{38}\text{Ar}$  and a determination of [Cl] in our flux monitor, we calculate [Cl] for the chondrite and melt samples of Chico as 77ppm and 84ppm, respectively. For the two unirradiated Chico samples, cosmogenic  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  and  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  were also primarily released at 1100-1500°C. However, the cosmogenic  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  ratio varied considerably during the releases, reaching high values around 1000°C of 4.4 and 9 for the chondritic and melt samples, respectively, and dropping to low values around 1400°C of 1.2-1.3. The variation in  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  was essentially that expected from the relative releases of  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  (from Cl) and  $^{37}\text{Ar}$  (from Ca) in irradiated samples, and indicates the presence of both high-energy and neutron-capture components for  $^{36}\text{Ar}$ . Values greater than  $\sim 5.3$  can only be produced from Cl. The average cosmogenic  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  for the chondritic and melt samples (after small corrections for low-temperature air Ar and  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  from probable Cl weathering products) were 1.76 and 2.27, respectively. The maxima in  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  for the unirradiated samples occurred at approximately the same extraction temperature as maxima in  $^{38}\text{Ar}/^{37}\text{Ar}$  for the irradiated samples. These data demonstrate that the cosmogenic  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  ratio in Chico is much higher than the typical value accepted for chondrites of  $\sim 0.65$ -0.7.

Assuming a high-energy spallation ratio of  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar} = 0.65$ , we calculate excesses of  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  produced by neutron capture on  $^{35}\text{Cl}$  for the chondritic and melt samples of  $2.6 \times 10^{-8}$  and  $3.4 \times 10^{-8}$  ccSTP/g, respectively. For a cosmic ray exposure age for Chico of 63 My (5), these  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  excesses correspond to a  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  production rate by thermal neutron capture of  $\sim 300$  atoms/minute/gram-Cl. By way of comparison, (4) observed an average excess of  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  in their Allende samples of  $\sim 2 \times 10^{-8}$  ccSTP/g and an average [Cl] of 2800ppm, which yields an average  $^{36}\text{Ar}$  production rate (with Allende exposure age = 5.2 My) of  $\sim 70$  atoms/min/g-Cl. For chondrites this calculated production rate (2, 6) rises from essentially the spallation-produced value at no shielding to values of 200-275 atoms/min/g-Cl or more at shielding levels of  $\sim 300$  g/cm<sup>2</sup> in large meteorites. Because bulk analyses of most chondrites yield measured  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  ratios higher than the assumed cosmogenic value of  $\sim 0.65$ , the  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  is corrected for trapped (or atmospheric) Ar using assumed end-member components and the lever rule. The Chico data suggest that for large chondrites the cosmogenic  $^{36}\text{Ar}/^{38}\text{Ar}$  ratio may well be significantly higher than 0.65 and therefore such a procedure may underestimate the concentration of cosmogenic  $^{38}\text{Ar}$ . In this context we note that in analyses of many Antarctic chondrites (7) observed that determined amounts of cosmogenic  $^{38}\text{Ar}$  averaged  $\sim 13\%$  too low in comparison to that expected from measurements of other cosmogenic species. Measurement of  $^{36}\text{Cl}$  in Chico is planned.

1) L. Schultz & H. Kruse, *Meteoritics* 24, 1989; 2) M. Spergel et al, *Proc. 16 LPSC*, 91, 1986; 3) K. Nishiizumi, *Nucl. Tracks Radiat. Meas.* 13, 1987; 4) R. Goebel et al, *GCA* 46, 1982; 5) D. Garrison et al, *LPS XXII*, 1991; P. Eberhardt et al, *Earth Sci. & Meteoritics*, 1963; 7) L. Schutz et al, *GCA* 55, 1991.